

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS




High Level

BOOK BINDERY LTD.

10372 - 60 Ave., Edmonton

"THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF
CRAFTSMANSHIP"



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2021 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Chapman1972>

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE NATURE AND ROLE OF REGIONAL OFFICES OF EDUCATION
IN THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA

by



ROBIN JAMES CHAPMAN

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1972

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The purpose of this study was to describe the nature of the undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "The Nature and Role of Regional Offices of Education in the Province of Alberta" submitted by Robin James Chapman in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to describe the nature and role of Regional Offices of Education (ROE) in the Province of Alberta. In particular, emphasis was placed on determining the characteristics of ROE staff and their perceptions of ROE objectives and functions. Assessments of the success of ROE, their difficulties and predictions of future developments were also considered.

A Regional Office of Education was defined as an intermediate educational unit operating as an extension of the provincial Department of Education. It performs regulatory functions as well as providing consultative services to local school districts. The programs and services it provides are designed to meet the educational needs of the region it serves.

The population for the study consisted of all the coordinators and consultants (N=44) in the six ROE operating in Alberta in November, 1971. Data for the study were collected by a questionnaire - "Functions of Regional Offices of Education in Alberta."

Most of the ROE staff were previously employed as superintendents, principals, vice-principals, department heads or teachers.

Almost all consultants (95 percent) considered that the provision of consultative services to teachers, school administrators and school boards was a major objective for ROE. Evaluation as an objective was closely linked to the provision of consultative services. Other major objectives were assisting in curriculum development and innovations, acting as a monitoring agent, and facilitating communication among educational systems.

Consultants challenged the need of the Department of Education to control and monitor education, but of those aspects that should be assessed by ROE, a preference was indicated for planning procedures for buildings, program development, provisions for special education and financial procedures. The need for continuing formal evaluation of schools and school systems was also questioned. Consultants placed a high importance on the attempt to equalize services between urban and rural areas.

One of the stated reasons for establishing ROE in Alberta has been the decentralization of some services previously provided by the Central Office of the Department of Education. The highest rating by consultants of their success was in the area of providing consultation for individual teachers, followed by consultation related to system-wide programs, the

interpretation of regulations, and evaluating individual schools.

Problems rated as "Very serious" to "Fairly serious" by half the consultants in influencing their effectiveness were the dispersion of small schools, the proportion of schools and teachers to ROE staff, and misconceptions about the role of the ROE. One of the major financial restrictions was that each ROE did not have an operating budget to use at its own discretion.

Sixty percent of consultants considered that there would be a change in the major functions of ROE in the next ten years.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The financial and other assistance provided by the Minister of Education and his officials in the Province of Alberta is gratefully acknowledged.

Mr. B. L. Stringham and Dr. W. R. Duke in the Field Services Branch of the Department of Education provided assistance, while all coordinators and consultants in the Regional Offices of Education cooperated in the collection of data.

Dr. D. Friesen supervised the writing of the thesis and gave challenging insights into the issues being examined. Dr. E. A. Holdaway provided the opportunity for the writer to undertake this study, supervised its administration and was a source of guidance and encouragement. Dr. G. L. Berry acted as the third member of the thesis committee.

The writer also wishes to acknowledge the assistance of his wife, Jan, and daughters, Donna and Bronwyn.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Definition	2
	Purpose of the Study	4
	Significance of the Study	5
	Delimitation	6
	Organization of the Thesis	6
II	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	7
	Status of the Intermediate Concept	8
	Need for Intermediate Units	10
	Benefits and Limitations of Intermediate Units	12
	Alternatives to the Intermediate Unit	14
	Future of the Intermediate Unit	15
III	METHODOLOGY	18
	Questionnaire	18
	The Population	20
	Data Collection	21
	Data Treatment	21
IV	ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	22
	REGIONAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION STAFF CHARACTERISTICS	23
	MAJOR OBJECTIVES FOR REGIONAL OFFICES OF EDUCATION	27
	Setting of Specific Tasks for Regional Offices	28

CHAPTER	PAGE
THE FUNCTIONS OF REGIONAL OFFICES OF EDUCATION	29
Procedures for the Department of Education to Control and Monitor Education in Alberta	29
Evaluation	33
Variations in Expectations for Regional Office of Education Functions	39
Duplication in Alberta Teachers' Association and Regional Office of Education Services	39
Supervision of Consultants	40
Channels of Communication	40
THE SUCCESS OF REGIONAL OFFICES OF EDUCATION	42
Equalizing Educational Services in Rural and Urban Areas	42
Consultative Services in Rural Areas	44
Success in Decentralization of Services	45
Benefits of the Work of Regional Offices of Education	47
THE DIFFICULTIES OF REGIONAL OFFICES OF EDUCATION	47
Operational Problems	47
Financial Problems	51
Staffing Needs	55
Administration Consultants	55
FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS IN REGIONAL OFFICES OF EDUCATION	59
Future Function	59

CHAPTER	PAGE
Coordination of Post Secondary Education	61
Coordination with other Government Departments	61
Secondment of Consultants	62
Regional Area	63
Restructuring of the Department of Education	63
V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS	65
SUMMARY	65
Purpose of the Study	65
Associated Literature	65
Methodology	66
Findings	66
CONCLUSIONS	69
IMPLICATIONS	71
SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	72
REFERENCES	74
APPENDIX A	77
APPENDIX B	102
APPENDIX C	104

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	Previous Employment Experience of ROE Staff	24
II	Previous Employment Position of ROE Staff Prior to Appointment	25
III	Aspects of the Operations of School Boards and Central Offices of School Districts, Divisions and Counties that Should Be Assessed	32
IV	Opinions of ROE Staff Concerning Importance that they Feel Is Attached to Areas of Evaluation by Various Groups	34
V	Established Avenues for Requesting ROE Services	41
VI	Opinions of ROE Concerning Success of ROE in Decentralization of Services	46
VII	Opinions of ROE Staff Concerning Seriousness of Problems Encountered in Operation of ROE	48
VIII	Opinions of ROE Staff Concerning Seriousness of Financial Restrictions Encountered in Operation of ROE	52
IX	Opinions of ROE Staff Concerning Priorities for Additional Staff for Each ROE	56

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A significant development in the structure of provincial Departments of Education in Canada has been the emergence in recent years of a network of Regional Offices of Education. Provinces which have established offices are Alberta, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Ontario, Quebec and Saskatchewan. In the United States there has been a longer period of development for the counterpart of the Regional Office of Education. The first county superintendent's office was created in Delaware in 1829 (Cooper and Fitzwater, 1954: 108), and by 1965 thirty-two states in the U.S.A. had some form of school government operating at an intermediate level between the state department of education and local school districts (Stephens, 1967a: 53). In Canada, the provinces of Ontario (1965) and Quebec (1966) were the first to establish Regional Offices.

The restructuring of organizations on a regional basis has been evident in both government and non-government areas (Tindal, 1968). While patterns of development in Regional Offices of Education are difficult to identify in Canada, there are some similarities. As

the responsibilities for the provision of public education have become more complex, small school districts in particular have been unable to make adequate provisions for the required services. The claim is made that neither local nor provincial levels of administration are able to appreciate each other's problems, and by operating between these, the Regional Office is able to develop a regional concern. Duplication of services and lack of coordination between government departments are popular criticisms, and the Regional Office of Education is in a position to initiate the coordination of education with other government services such as health, labor and social welfare. Another factor accounting for the development of Regional Offices is the concern of central offices to provide more effective administration. Central administrations appear to have become sensitive to criticisms of their increasing size, bureaucratization, impersonality, and remoteness. The decentralization of authority and services through a network of Regional Offices of Education has as one of its objectives, increased local participation and identification.

Definition

The structure of intermediate educational units has taken several forms. Decentralization of the state department of education and the establishment of a

number of regional offices is at one end of the scale. In the United States however, intermediate educational units are less closely associated with the state department of education, and consist of an intermediate level of school government coterminous with county boundaries. Emerson (1967:33) has referred to the intermediate unit as "the middle echelon of a state school system made up of a state education office, numerous local school districts and less numerous intermediate school districts." For Knezevich (1962:141), the intermediate unit of school administration is a "betweenener."

Structurally and functionally, the intermediate unit lies between the state on the one hand and the local district on the other. It is an arm of the state but occupies territory that encompasses many local school districts. It is charged by the state educational agency with certain educational responsibilities, but it provides services to the local district.

The intermediate unit operates under several names: Board of Cooperative Services (in Colorado); Office of the County Superintendent (in Iowa); Intermediate School District (in Michigan); Educational Service Unit (in Nebraska); Cooperative Educational Service Agency (in Wisconsin).

In Alberta, the Regional Office of Education is an extension of the provincial Department of Education, performing regulatory functions as well as providing

consultative services to local school districts. Programs and services are adapted to meet the specific educational needs of the region in which the office is located.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe the nature and role of Regional Offices of Education in the province of Alberta. The focus was on the following questions.

Staff. What has been the previous work experience and academic preparation of Regional Office consultants?

Objectives. What are the objectives of Regional Offices as perceived by consultants?

Functions. What are the consultants' perceptions of the functions of Regional Offices?

Success. How successful have Regional Offices been?

Difficulties. What are the difficulties encountered in the operation of Regional Offices?

Future Developments. What future trends are predicted in the development of Regional Offices?

Significance of the Study

An Iowa study (Stephens, 1967a:15) noted that "if the intermediate unit of school administration did not already exist, someone would have to invent it." Thirty-two states in the U.S.A., and eight Canadian Provinces have already established some form of intermediate educational unit. As the responsibilities for the provision of public education have become more complex, many school districts have been unable to make adequate arrangements for programs and services. The inability of small districts to make these provisions has been used to emphasize the need for an intermediate agency between the central government department and the local school district.

The associated literature refers to contradictions and confusion in the philosophical and theoretical framework of intermediate units. In view of the developments in the Canadian provinces which have established Regional Offices of Education, clarification of this situation is important. If it is accepted that some form of intermediate educational unit is necessary to supply adequate programs and services especially in small school districts, then it is necessary to become aware of the nature and role of such an agency.

Delimitation

This study was delimited to the six Regional Offices operating in Alberta during November 1971.

Organization of the Thesis

Chapter II provides a review of the literature related to the study.

Chapter III presents the methodology of the study, and includes a description of the population, the development of the questionnaire used, and the methods of data collection and data treatment.

Chapter IV presents an analysis of the data.

Chapter V contains a summary of the study, a statement of the main conclusions, a discussion of the implications arising from the study, and some suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Literature devoted entirely to a consideration of Regional Offices of Education appears to be limited to position papers prepared by provincial Departments of Education. In Canada, Regional Offices of Education, while fulfilling most of the functions of intermediate units, are appropriately regarded as extensions of the provincial department. Most of the writers describing the U.S. scene perceive the intermediate unit in terms of a locally controlled single county organization. With this distinction in mind, the terms Regional Office of Education and intermediate unit are used synonymously for the purpose of this review. The present status of the intermediate unit is considered , followed by a consideration of whether it is or is not needed in the structure of school administration. Some of the benefits and limitations of the intermediate unit are noted, along with possible alternative arrangements. Finally, some predictions for future developments in intermediate units are reviewed.

Status of the Intermediate Unit Concept

McClure (1956:14) has noted that "for 50 years or so men have had different ideas as to the nature of organization and function of the intermediate administrative district." This comment is still appropriate. Various writers indicate that the role and functions of intermediate units have not always been fully determined (Morphet et al., 1967: 280), or that there has been confused preparation (Campbell et al., 1970: 125). In discussing the role and function of the regional office as an intermediate unit, Nault (1970:29) stated that it "has not yet been clearly conceptualized and defined, even by those state school systems provided with a R.O. [regional office] network." Isenberg (1966:26-7) was also critical of the apparent absence of planning to enable a new type of organization to achieve its objectives. His concern was with the interrelationships between the various levels of a state education system-- "when we tinker with one segment of it, all the other levels are affected." In addition to noting that the various levels of a state educational system are interrelated, an Iowa report (Stephens, 1967a:52) has stressed the "equal partnership" concept. It observes that intermediate units should not be regarded as substitutes for local districts, nor should they be seen as necessarily in a superordinate position.

The dichotomy between service and regulatory functions in the intermediate unit has been evident in the literature for some time, but there are indications that the service function is becoming predominant. Knezevich (1962:153) has traced the origins of the intermediate unit to deficiencies in school district administration, and noted that its early functions were administrative, statistical and supervisory. In contrast, Nault (1970:13) in a recent report holds strongly to the position that "as an administrative arm of the state educational agency, the R.O. [regional office] must perform a number of regulatory or ministerial functions." While the intermediate unit may operate as "an arm of the state," no justification is provided for a complete delegation of all of the state education department's functions. McClure (1956:59) observed that the functions of the intermediate unit were "shifting from a line-oriented status to a staff-oriented status--that is from directive to advisory." More recently, a Utah study (McHenry, 1965) has demonstrated that many of the regulatory functions have been replaced by the intermediate agency's new leadership role.

There is some evidence in Canada and the U.S.A. that until the intermediate unit establishes itself, it faces an insecure future because of its vulnerable position. This position has been noted by Campbell (1970: 123).

. . . any unit which attempts to find a place between the legally fixed responsibility for education at the state level and the jealously guarded operation of schools at the local district level is inevitably in trouble.

Need for Intermediate Units

Differences of opinion occur in the literature as to the need for intermediate units; reports from the U.S.A. concentrate on the inadequacies of small districts. The Iowa study (Stephens, 1967c:7-8) indicated that the major needs of elementary and secondary education in that state related essentially to the limitations of local school districts. Four interrelated limitations originated from inadequate enrolment size, deficiencies in educational programs, the provision of professional personnel and inadequate financial resources. Of all school districts in the study, 80 percent had a total enrolment of less than 1500 students. School size in turn was related to the comprehensiveness of programs offered and the provision of special services such as pupil guidance, libraries, and remedial programs. The assignment of high school teachers to their teaching specialization was directly related to school enrolment, and only the larger schools were able to meet this objective.

Recognition of the fact that over three quarters of the local school districts in Iowa in 1966-67 had fewer than 1500 students raises serious questions concerning the economic and efficient functioning of these units in the provision of quality educational programs and services

Three studies in Nebraska (McPherran, 1954; Ellison, 1959; Turner, 1959) noted that the intermediate unit will still be necessary after consolidation of school districts, and that the cost of services was a problem for some districts (McPherran, 1954:295).

Many services are too costly for small local school districts to provide for themselves. An intermediate school district, by serving a number of small local school districts, will be able to provide them at a reasonable cost.

A similar situation was referred to (Hawkesworth, 1971:1) in Alberta, where:

It had been evident for some time that a serious imbalance existed between the educational leadership and supervisory services available to rural school jurisdictions and those available to urban school systems.

Most writers in justifying the need for intermediate units, concentrate on inadequacies at the school district level. Nault (1970:19-26) refers also to the limitations of provincial and state departments of education. He considers that, (1) their general effectiveness is being questioned, (2) a more forceful leadership is required, (3) the state must expand its service role, (4) local units are often remote from the state or provincial capital, (5) there has been a failure

to develop long range and comprehensive planning, and
(6) there is no interdepartmental coordination.

Benefits and Limitations of Intermediate Units

In a review of the associated literature, Nault (1970:60) has referred to the difficulty in stating distinct benefits and limitations of intermediate units because of their short period of operation, especially in Canada. From a comprehensive study of the multi-county Regional Educational Service Agency in Iowa (Stephens, 1967c:36-39), some major benefits have been listed. As an intermediate unit, it (1) protects and promotes local control and determination in public education, (2) equalizes and extends educational opportunities, (3) assures efficient and economical operation of many educational programs, (4) improves the quality of many educational programs, (5) provides a needed change agent in education, (6) promotes the restructuring of school government consistent with developments in the public and private sectors, and (7) improves the coordination of local, regional and statewide educational planning.

Some specific limitations of the regional office form of organization have been noted by Morphet et al. (1967:280) who express fears of increased state control and the inability of state education officials

to meet local needs. The extensive reorganization and consolidation of local administrative units is mentioned by Van Miller (1965:137-139), while Campbell et al. (1970:124) state that the possible centralization of school operations is not in keeping with the usual administration of schools in the U.S.A.

A more penetrating analysis of potential limitations or problems to be encountered in establishing a network of regional offices is provided by Nault (1970:65-79). He distinguishes between conceptual, operational and jurisdictional problems. Establishment of a regional office network entails a reexamination of the roles and functions of provincial and local educational bodies. Regional units of administration may cut across established jurisdictional boundaries, and the limited knowledge of regional planning and development may restrict the effective implementation of programs. Among the operational problems there tends to be insufficient delegation of authority, resistance of central office to sharing power, and role ambiguities for regional office staff. The addition of an intermediate level unit may create an even more "cumbersome bureaucracy," the effectiveness of the service role can be overshadowed by the ministerial and regulatory functions, and unrealistic expectations may also limit the contributions of the

regional office. Existing administrative and legal requirements are mentioned as possible jurisdictional limitations. (Nault, 1970:78)

The myth that the state education chief executive must stand responsible for every decision, perhaps more than any other single factor, is deterring state administration from utilizing the policy and decision making process in a creative manner to accommodate for regional differences and regional administration.

Alternatives to the Intermediate Unit

A central concern in the literature is to establish whether the intermediate unit is needed. While Campbell et al, (1970:123) consider that on a functional basis intermediate educational units and Regional Offices of Education are similar, structurally the regional office is presented as an alternative. Three alternatives to the intermediate unit are (1) compulsory combinations of districts into single administrative units with no less than 10,000-12,000 pupils, (2) cooperative arrangements may be made between small local districts, and (3) the decentralization of state departments of education to establish a number of regional offices. Other alternatives may be found in a more rational distribution of responsibility between state and local agencies, or a fundamental move to strengthen state education departments (Nault, 1970: 47).

Future of the Intermediate Unit

To discuss the future of anything, is as Emerson (1967: 19) suggests, mere speculation. Because there is so much confusion, contradiction and uncertainty about the role and function of intermediate units, predictions made on such a basis are even more hazardous.

Some writers have seen the intermediate unit as particularly appropriate in a rural environment. Campbell et al. (1970: 133) describe the increasing strength of the intermediate unit in metropolitan settings and call for cooperation and integrated planning in solving urban-rural educational problems. Indicative of the preparation made for intermediate units by some education departments is Morphet's observation (1967: 286) that some large urban school systems tend to ignore intermediate units in the belief that they can adequately provide for their own services and programs. Similarly, some small districts are preoccupied with maintaining local control against interference by state departments of education via the intermediate unit. Isenberg (1966: 26-27) criticises the seclusion of some urban education officials who "still stop thinking when they reach the city line."

Emerging from the confusion, some writers see a new type of intermediate unit evolving, and suggest that its traditional form must undergo drastic changes if it is to perform a worthwhile function. For Knezevich (1962:159)

the intermediate unit:

. . . should not be abolished, but rather redesigned to perform a more vital role in educational administration.

Rhodes (1963: 13) refers to the "new and emerging" intermediate unit in these terms:

The Intermediate Unit in its newly emerging form is a product of efforts to meet new needs in education. Its benefits have been demonstrated in many parts of the U.S.A., and its potential advantages are being widely recognized. However, it must undergo still greater developments and utilization before it is in a position to deliver all benefits of which it is capable. Unquestionably, much greater use of this important educational agency will come about as a result of the tremendous pressures being placed upon the schools by current world tensions and the growing public demand for better educational opportunities for more people at a reasonable cost.

The administrative tool that can make better education possible at less cost has been invented. It now remains for an enlightened public and a resourceful profession to put it to greater use.

With confusion in the literature, little has been written on the concept of intermediate educational units. There do appear to be structural and functional dimensions. In the U.S.A., intermediate units occupy a definite intermediate level between the state department and school districts, as well as performing mainly service functions. The Regional Office however, as an intermediate educational unit, is conceptualized as an extension of the state department and performs mainly regulatory and service functions. Justification for intermediate educational units centers on the inadequacies of small districts, and

this needs to be related to the provision of consultative services in rural areas which is considered in Chapter IV. Some of the stated benefits of intermediate units which can be compared with those of the Regional Office include extending educational opportunities, increasing the efficient operation of school districts, improving the quality of programs, and introducing innovations.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Questionnaire

Three sources were used in preparing the questionnaire -- "Functions of Regional Offices of Education in Alberta," the final form of which is included in Appendix A. Correspondence and position papers related to the establishment of Regional Offices in Alberta were made available by the provincial Department of Education. These documents revealed formal statements of objectives for Regional Offices, descriptions of functions, and some indication of problems being encountered in the early stages of office operation. A review of the literature indicated an almost complete preoccupation with intermediate educational units in the U.S.A., but nevertheless was valuable in highlighting the trend from regulatory to service functions. Interviews conducted with the six Regional Office coordinators gave some insight into the practical operations of offices, and provided ideas for such items as the assessment of school boards, different attitudes to evaluation, and problems related to the financial allocation to Regional Offices.

A draft questionnaire was submitted to central office personnel in the Department of Education and faculty members in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Alberta. Recommendations for improvements included, for example, changed wording of items and layout, and were incorporated in the questionnaire before it was finally printed.

The basic questionnaire answered by all consultants and coordinators consisted of thirty-two items. Divisions of the questionnaire and their subsequent items were designed to provide data for the questions outlined in the purpose of the study. These divisions were, (A) Personal Data, (B) Objectives and Functions, (C) Use Made of the Regional Office, (D) Difficulties Encountered, and (E) Speculative.

Another division was added for administration consultants and included one open-ended item asking for comments on special problems they encountered. Coordinators received two additional items (Items 33, 34) to the basic questionnaire which were directed at the channels of communication used in Regional Offices, and the methods of supervision of consultants.

The Population

The population included all the coordinators and consultants working in the six Regional Offices of Education in Alberta in November, 1971. Some of these regional offices had commenced operations prior to 1971, operating essentially as regional headquarters for inspectors of schools, and it was not until September 1971 that all six offices were considered to be fully operational within the terms of their prescribed functions. The distribution of respondents in the various offices was as follows:

	<u>Regional Office of Education</u>	<u>Coordinators</u>	<u>Consultants</u>
Zone 1. Grande Prairie		1	7
Zone 2. Athabasca		1	4
Zone 3. Edmonton		1	9
Zone 4. Red Deer		1	6
Zone 5. Calgary		1	7
Zone 6. Lethbridge		<u>1</u>	<u>5</u>
	Total	6	38

(The term "zone" is used synonymously by the Alberta Department of Education to signify a "region.")

Data Collection

In November 1971, the questionnaire "Functions of Regional Offices of Education in Alberta" was mailed individually to all coordinators and consultants in the Regional Offices of Alberta. Two letters were included with each questionnaire; one from the Division of Field Services of the Department of Education (Appendix B), requested the cooperation of Regional Office personnel in the study, and the other (Appendix C) briefly explained the origin of the study, its purpose and the method of completing and returning the questionnaire. By early December 1971, questionnaires had been returned separately by mail by all forty-four participants.

Data Treatment

The responses to most items were analysed by using frequency and percentage frequency distributions. Where open-ended questions were provided, responses were first categorized and then frequencies determined. Verbatim comments were added to the statistical analysis of items when it was considered that they were pertinent.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings of the study in the six major areas of concern.

These were:

- (1) Regional Office staff characteristics.
- (2) The objectives of Regional Offices of Education.
- (3) The functions of Regional Offices of Education.
- (4) The success of Regional Offices in decentralizing services previously provided by the Central Office of the Department of Education.
- (5) The difficulties of Regional Offices of Education.
- (6) Future developments in Regional Offices of Education.

In subsequent reference to Regional Offices of Education, the abbreviation ROE will be used.

REGIONAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
STAFF CHARACTERISTICS

Questions 1-4 of the questionnaire (Appendix A) sought a description of the work experience of ROE staff, their previous position prior to appointment, and the nature of their academic preparation.

From the data presented in Table I, the predominant areas of experience for staff have been as superintendents or the in-school positions of principal, vice-principal, department head and classroom teacher. More than half of the ROE staff were previously employed as superintendents or assistant superintendents, as indicated in Table II. Almost three quarters of the staff have a master's degree, as indicated by the following data.

<u>Degree</u>	<u>Number of ROE Staff (N=44)</u>
Bachelor's degree	43
Two bachelor's degrees or a bachelor's degree and graduate diploma	21
Master's degree	30
Doctoral degree	3

While three quarters of the staff had received some academic qualification within the last ten years, one quarter of the staff had received their latest

TABLE I
Previous Employment Experience of ROE Staff

(N = 44)

Location	Positions Held Prior to September, 1971	Number of ROE Staff	Mean Years Position Held	Range of Years Position Held
Department of Education	High School Inspector	5	4.6	10 - 2
	Superintendent	32	9.0	28 - 1
	Consultant	8	2.3	4 - 1
	Other	7	1.0	3 - 1
Local	Superintendent	-	-	-
Jurisdiction Central Office	Assistant Superintendent	3	2.7	4 - 2
	Consultant	3	2.0	3 - 1
	Other	1	2.0	-
Local	Principal	28	6.9	21 - 2
Jurisdiction School Based	Vice-Principal and/or Department Head	24	3.6	13 - 1
	Classroom Teacher	39	5.6	12 - 2
	Counselor	2	4.0	5 - 3
	Other	1	1.0	-
Other		9	3.6	9 - 1

TABLE II

Previous Employment Position of ROE Staff

Prior to Appointment

(N = 44)

Position	Number of ROE Staff	Employing Authority		Mean Years Position Held	Range of Years Position Held	
		Dept. of Ed.	Local Jurisdic. Other			
Supt. or Asst. Supt.	26	20	6	-	7.3	25 - 1
High School Inspector	3	3	-	-	5.3	10 - 2
Principal - Vice-Principal	3	-	3	-	10.7	15 - 5
Consultant	3	-	3	-	2.7	4 - 1
Other	9	-	4	5	3.0	8 - 1

qualification from eleven to thirty-three years ago.

<u>Year of Most Recent Qualification</u>	<u>Number of ROE Staff</u>
1967 - 1971	17
1962 - 1966	13
1957 - 1961	3
1952 - 1956	5
To 1951	4

Respondents were also asked to indicate if they were enrolled in a university graduate program, and to state the university and degree sought. The results obtained were:

<u>University</u>	<u>Degree Sought</u>	
	<u>Doctoral</u>	<u>Master's</u>
University of Alberta	4	3
University of Montana	2	1
University of Oregon	4	1
Other	2	

MAJOR OBJECTIVES FOR REGIONAL
OFFICES OF EDUCATION

In a Field Services position paper (Province of Alberta, 1971), the order of priorities for Regional Office activities was stated to be:

- (1) Ministerial investigations.
- (2) Urban evaluations.
- (3) Curriculum --committees and examinations
- (4) Rural evaluations.
- (5) Consultation.

The time anticipated for each task was expected to be inversely proportional to its order of priority.

In response to the question "What do you think should be the major objectives for Regional Offices of Education in Alberta?", the following replies were received:

(1) Almost all (95 percent) considered that the provision of consultative services to teachers, school administrators and school boards was a major objective.

(2) The concept of evaluation was closely linked to the provision of consultative services, and it was strongly emphasized that consultation is usually preceded by evaluation, but not in the style of previous "inspections." Evaluation was considered by 68 percent to be a major objective.

(3) Assisting in curriculum development and facilitating innovations were major objectives for 50 percent.

(4) Acting as a monitoring agent was a major objective for 50 percent of respondents.

(5) The facilitation of communication within and among the educational systems was considered a major objective by 41 percent.

(6) Conducting investigations and mediating in disputes on behalf of the Department of Education (20 percent), involvement in the regional coordination of education (18 percent), and provision of a resource center (11 percent) were less frequently mentioned as major objectives.

Setting of Specific Tasks for Regional Offices

Tasks set by each ROE. All coordinators were able to state specific tasks that had been established for their Regional Office, ranging from a survey of overall educational needs of the region, to upgrading programs in early childhood education, language arts and social studies. Some striking contrasts existed between the specific tasks stated by coordinators and those perceived by consultants. For example, one coordinator listed three specific tasks, while one of his consultants felt that no specific tasks had been established for that ROE.

Tasks set by the Department of Education for each ROE. In response to the question, "Have any specific tasks been set for your Regional Office by the Department of Education?", 54 percent replied "yes," 32 percent replied "no," and 14 percent were "undecided." While many responses reflected the tasks proposed in Department position papers, some examples were provided of specifically assigned tasks. For example, one task was to investigate and pose solutions to educational problems faced by Indian and Metis students. One respondent suggested that the ROE had been left "to determine their own destiny," but another expressed concern at how some consultants could perform multi-zone responsibilities.

THE FUNCTIONS OF REGIONAL OFFICES OF EDUCATION

Procedures for the Department of Education to Control and Monitor Education in Alberta

The controlling and monitoring function. To survey attitudes towards this function and the extent of ROE involvement, the following three questions were asked:

Question (1) "Assuming that the Department of Education has to continue to control and monitor education in Alberta . . . , do you believe that all

schools in your Zone should be visited periodically. . .?"

Replies were, "yes" 50 percent, "no" 27 percent, and "undecided" 23 percent.

Question (2) Those replying "yes" to Question

(1) (n=21) were asked, "Who should visit schools?"

Replies were:

- 19 - ROE personnel
- 1 - Include other ROE personnel from nearby Zones
- 1 - Coordinator and/or Administration Consultant

Question (3) Those replying "no" to Question

(1) (n=12) were asked, "Do you feel that the control and monitoring functions should be performed by Department of Education staff not based in an ROE?" Replies were, "yes" five, "no" five, and "undecided" two.

The assumption of control and monitoring as a function of ROE was strongly challenged. It was considered to be not necessary and some systems have gone on for years without monitoring. Where monitoring and control were considered necessary, they could be handled by superintendents and boards, with ROE staff assisting when requested. If the consultative function is to be developed, then it was considered that the regulatory function must be assigned to other personnel.

Assessment of the operations of school boards and central offices. Using the same assumption of control and monitoring, the question was asked, "What aspects of the operations of school boards and central offices of school districts, divisions and counties should be assessed?" Responses are set out in Table III. Of the aspects that should be assessed by ROE, a strong preference is indicated for planning procedures for buildings, program development, provisions for special education, and financial procedures. Some indecision occurred in the area of program development where 21 percent (n=9) of consultants answered either "no" or "undecided." In addition, library and guidance services, and attendance procedures were mentioned as areas in which the ROE should be involved in assessment.

Monitoring of the large urban systems. If ROE staff have to monitor the large urban systems, is it necessary to visit schools in order to perform this function? In response to this question, 86 percent replied "yes," 2 percent "no," and 12 percent were "undecided." Of those replying "yes," 72 percent considered that this function could be performed adequately by using a sample of schools. The most frequently mentioned aspects that should be assessed in the large urban systems are listed below.

TABLE III

Aspects of the Operations of School Boards and Central Offices of School Districts,
Divisions and Counties that Should be Assessed

(N = 44)

Aspects	YES %	NO %	UNDECIDED %
a. School board meeting procedures	19	56	25
b. Financial procedures	77	5	18
c. Personnel procedures	19	58	23
d. Program development procedures	79	16	5
e. Planning procedures for new buildings and extensions	86	3	11
f. Maintenance procedures for existing buildings	44	37	19
g. Procedures for obtaining supplies and equipment	19	67	14
h. Transportation procedures	49	30	21
i. Procedures for providing special education	79	12	9

<u>Aspects</u>	<u>Number of Times Mentioned</u>
Program development	16
Facilities	8
Administration	6
Provisions for pupil needs	5

Evaluation

Importance attached to evaluation by consultants, superintendents, and principals/teachers. Respondents were asked to rate the importance they attached to various areas of evaluation, and then to estimate the importance that they thought superintendents, principals and teachers associated with each area. Results are illustrated in Table IV, using the following scale.

- Scale:
- 6. Very important
 - 5. Fairly important
 - 4. Slightly important
 - 3. Not important
 - 2. Undecided
 - 1. Don't know

The evaluation of an entire school system was seen to be "very important" to "fairly important" for consultants and superintendents. Similar importance was attached to the evaluation of individual schools for consultants and superintendents, although this rating

TABLE IV

Opinions of ROE Staff Concerning Importance that they Feel Is
Attached to Areas of Evaluation by Various Groups

Areas of Evaluation	N	Importance						
		Very Fairly Slightly Not					Undecided	Don't Know
		6	5	4	3	2		
a. Entire School System	43 Consultants	10	17	8	5	3	-	-
	43 Superintendents	14	13	8	4	2	2	2
	43 Principals/Teachers	3	12	11	13	2	2	2
b. Individual Schools	43 Consultants	19	21	2	1	-	-	-
	43 Superintendents	18	18	4	-	2	2	1
	43 Principals/Teachers	11	14	11	3	3	1	1
c. Individual Teachers	43 Consultants	3	10	10	18	2	1	1
	43 Superintendents	14	15	4	7	1	2	2
	43 Principals/Teachers	9	8	6	17	1	2	2
d. Programs in All Schools in a School System	43 Consultants	18	18	4	1	1	1	1
	43 Superintendents	9	22	8	-	2	2	2
	43 Principals/Teachers	8	14	11	8	1	1	1

TABLE IV (Continued)

Areas of Evaluation	N	Importance							Undecided	Don't Know
		Very Fairly					Slightly Not			
		6	5	4	3	2	1			
e. Programs in a Particular Grade or a Group of Grades in a School System	42	Consultants	10	16	10	5	1	-		
	42	Superintendents	7	11	15	5	1	3		
	42	Principals/Teachers	7	11	11	9	2	2		
f. Programs in a Particular School	43	Consultants	19	20	3	-	-	1		
	43	Superintendents	14	19	6	1	1	2		
	43	Principals/Teachers	14	13	6	6	2	2		
g. Programs in a Particular Grade in a Particular School	43	Consultants	9	14	12	7	-	1		
	43	Superintendents	8	15	8	5	3	4		
	43	Principals/Teachers	10	9	10	7	2	5		

was slightly higher than that perceived for principals and teachers. While evaluation of individual teachers was not perceived to be important for consultants, principals and teachers, superintendents were perceived to place a high importance on this area. A slightly higher importance for consultants and superintendents than for principals and teachers was attached to the evaluation of programs in all schools and to programs in a particular grade or group of grades in a school system. Consultants were virtually unanimous in rating the evaluation of programs in a particular school as "very important" or "fairly important." However, the importance perceived to be attached to this area by superintendents, principals and teachers was not as high. Although there was not complete unanimity amongst consultants in the importance attached to evaluation of programs in a particular grade in a particular school, consultants tended to rate this function as more important than they felt superintendents and principals/teachers would rate it.

The need for continuing formal evaluation. "Do you think that there is a need for continuing formal evaluation . . . of schools and school systems throughout Alberta by Department of Education central office staff who are located in Edmonton . . . if Regional Office

staff are unable to perform this function?" In response to this question, 45 percent replied "yes," 35 percent replied "no," and 16 percent were "undecided." Some of the individual comments in favor of continuing formal evaluation by central office staff were, (1) there are too many schools for ROE staff to evaluate, (2) central office staff would benefit from contact with schools, and (3) there is "a need for formal evaluation otherwise every school system would vary its program." Points raised against the proposal referred to, (1) the level of trust established with teachers by ROE staff, (2) a belief that there were more pressing needs requiring finance, (3) an overall questioning of the merits of evaluation, and (4) a suggestion that evaluation is "ineffective regardless of who carries it out."

Evaluatory function and credibility. In response to the question, "Do you feel that the evaluatory function of your Regional Office interferes with your credibility as a consultant?", 16 percent replied "yes," 61 percent replied "no," and 23 percent were "undecided." Comments on this question suggested that evaluation does interfere with credibility when "evaluation" is used in its "traditional meaning," but there was a strong expression of opinion that evaluation is an integral part of consultation.

Evaluation used for dismissal. When a superintendent within a ROE zone requires an evaluation of a certificated teacher which may provide some of the evidence for dismissal, who should perform this evaluation? The three categories of personnel that were suggested are as follows (N=44):

<u>Potential Evaluating Group</u>	<u>Yes</u> %	<u>No</u> %	<u>Undecided</u> %
1. The Zone Regional Office	25	66	9
2. A ROE in a different Zone	52	39	9
3. Department Central Office	43	43	14

In addition, the following comments were made:

(i) "The ROE should not be associated with dismissal when it is attempting to help such teachers."

(ii) "The coordinator or [administration] consultant could do it."

(iii) "A cooperative team of Department and A.T.A. [Alberta Teachers' Association] personnel."

ROE involvement in evaluation and development of large urban systems. When consultants were asked what value they saw in them being involved with development and evaluation of instructional programs in the larger urban school systems, most respondents suggested that their involvement would provide broader perspectives and

more objectivity as well as being a valuable experience for consultants.

Variations in Expectations for ROE Functions

Seventy percent of the consultants agreed that they experienced a wide range of expectations for the functions of the ROE. Reference was made to the lack of understanding of the role of the ROE, with expectations ranging from the ROE being responsible for the removal of unsatisfactory teachers to being an "inspecting" group for school trustees. One comment noted that "our clients expect us to be providing a much broader range of services," while for the range of expectations it was suggested that they were no greater than those prescribed in Departmental position papers.

Duplication in A.T.A. and ROE Services

Forty-one percent of consultants stated that there was duplication in the services provided by the Alberta Teachers' Association and the ROE. In the 34 percent who considered that there was no duplication, reference was made to consultants being members of A.T.A. specialist councils and the cooperative relationships that had been developed.

Supervision of Consultants

The six coordinators of ROE were asked to give some indication of how they supervise the work of consultants. Three coordinators specifically indicated that there was a "minimum" of supervision or "no supervision." All ROE used regular staff meetings, and for some coordinators this represented the main method of supervision. Individual features mentioned by some offices included the head secretary attending part of each staff meeting, holding special planning and evaluative sessions, and developing a circulating file of current correspondence. In one ROE, consultants were encouraged to discuss their consultative programs with the coordinator, and in another a master calendar was used to inform all staff of consultants' activities.

Channels of Communication

Coordinators of ROE were asked to indicate what official contacts have been established in directing requests to the ROE. For example, if a request for consultative services was indicated to be of the "teacher-principal-superintendent" type, a teacher would have to direct his request to the principal, who would seek the approval of the superintendent, and the superintendent would then notify the ROE. Table V provides some indication of existing channels of communication.

TABLE V

Established Avenues for Requesting ROE Services

REGIONAL OFFICE	Total School Jurisdictions	Avenues For Requests					Not Yet Established
		T-P-S	P-S	S	T-P	P	
1 Grande Prairie	13		✓+	✓			
2 Athabasca	16	5	4	2		1	3
3 Edmonton	48	16	2	6		17	7
4 Red Deer	18	11	3	4			
5 Calgary	16		12			4	
6 Lethbridge	30	12	2	2	4	6	4
TOTALS		44	23	14	4	28	14

+ No figures were provided, the majority of requests being in the columns indicated.

A large proportion of requests for services are required to be processed "through the hierarchy," as one coordinator described the teacher-principal-superintendent contact, and the limited number of contacts which may be made by teachers independently or through the principal may be related to the number of times they expect to use the services of the ROE.

THE SUCCESS OF REGIONAL OFFICES OF EDUCATION

Equalizing Educational Services in Rural and Urban Areas

One of the stated reasons for establishing ROE in Alberta was to equalize services between urban and rural areas. Consultants were asked to respond to questions covering the importance of this objective in their priorities, any difficulties they encountered, particular programs that were used, and the effect of their work in rural areas on the provision of services to urban schools.

Importance. Forty consultants indicated that the equalization of services between urban and rural areas was "very important" to "fairly important" in determining their priorities for allocation of services. In elaborating on the importance of this objective, consultants mentioned that rural areas have had limited

support staff in the past, and they "lack contact with current educational ideas." It was also noted that the provision of consultative services "is the greatest justification for the ROE."

Difficulties in providing services to rural areas. Particular difficulties were experienced by 67 percent of consultants in providing services to rural areas. The most frequently mentioned difficulties were: (1) distances and inadequate travel allowances, (2) ignorance of services available from the ROE, (3) superintendents wanting to "run their own show" or "holding the reins" on calling for services, (4) suspicion from superintendents and boards who were not convinced of the need for ROE, (5) lack of qualified teachers in a consultant's speciality, (6) the number of teachers to be served, (7) a lack of resource materials, (8) teachers who were unwilling or slow to change, (9) a lack of consultants in certain fields, and (10) limited time.

Particular programs used to improve services. Some of the particular programs used to improve services in rural areas included cooperating with locally employed senior administrators in school evaluation, exchanging consultative services between the various ROE, developing a resources center, advertising ROE services,

and making office hours more flexible.

Effect of work in rural areas on services to urban schools and school systems. Eighty-one percent of consultants did not agree that the concern to equalize services between rural and urban areas had interfered with their activities in urban school systems.

Consultative Services in Rural Areas

Excluding the services provided by the ROE and the Alberta Teachers' Association, consultants were asked to assess the extent of consultative services available to teachers in rural areas and to make recommendations for improvements.

Assessment. Thirty-six consultants used terms such as "very little available" or "minimal" in assessing the extent of consultative services available to teachers in rural areas.

Recommendations. To improve educational services in rural areas consultants recommended that they be provided with materials and curriculum building experience. There should be provision for more exchange between consultants of different systems, and for cooperation between systems in the appointment of specialists, particularly in clinical services. Similarly, superintendents should be encouraged to visit more

schools and there should be exchange of expertise among neighboring schools. Recommended changes in the staffing of ROE included, locating basic subject area consultants in ROE with specialist services provided from Edmonton and Calgary, and appointing superintendents to each office to provide assistance in general administration, supervision and programing. Financial recommendations included a general request to examine the funding procedures of the School Foundation Program, and in the absence of incentive grants to facilitate appointments by counties and divisions, there should be an increase in ROE staff and developmental projects.

Success in Decentralization of Services

As ROE have been established to provide decentralization of some of the services previously provided by the Central Office of the Department of Education in Edmonton, consultants were asked to rate the success of decentralization in various services. The results are included in Table VI. In making further comments, consultants raised some issues which are significant in evaluating the success of ROE services at this stage. It was noted that ROE have been operating for a short time only, that "the modus operandi of ROE is not yet known by schools" and that "locally appointed superintendents are just settling

TABLE VI
Opinions of ROE Staff Concerning Success
of ROE in Decentralization of Services

Service Area	Success in Decentralizing Service					N
	5 Very Successful	4 Fairly Successful	3 Slightly Successful	2 Not Successful	1 Undecided	
Consultation Related to System-Wide Programs	11	22	5	2	3	43
Consultation for Individual Teachers	18	22	3	-	-	43
Interpreting Department of Education Regulations	12	21	4	1	5	43
Evaluating School Systems	5	13	13	3	8	42
Evaluating Individual Schools	13	19	7	1	2	42
Involving Teachers in Curriculum Development	4	19	13	2	5	43
Assistance in Planning School Buildings	2	8	15	6	10	41

into their new positions."

Benefits of the Work of Regional Offices of Education

The main benefits resulting from the work of the ROE as perceived by consultants were (1) boards and teachers have been receiving assistance not previously available, (2) there has been an improvement in the relationships between the Department and school systems, (3) an in-depth evaluative-consultative approach to programs has started, (4) new curricula have had a better chance of implementation and there has been a development of interest in modifying curricula to meet local needs, (5) teacher in-service programs have been extended, (6) a new approach to "inspection" has been initiated, and (7) there has been an increasing awareness of resources available at ROE.

THE DIFFICULTIES OF REGIONAL OFFICES OF EDUCATION

Operational Problems

Departmental correspondence and interviews with coordinators had revealed some of the problems being encountered in ROE. These problems were listed and consultants asked to rate the seriousness of each according to its influence on their effectiveness. Results are tabulated in Table VII. Problems rated

TABLE VII

Opinions of ROE Staff Concerning Seriousness
of Problems Encountered in Operation of ROE

(N = 44)

Problem	Seriousness					Undecided	Don't Know
	Very	Fairly	Slightly	Not			
	6	5	4	3		2	1
Geographical Dispersion of Small Schools	5	14	10	15		-	-
Restrictions on Travel Due to Adverse Weather	1	6	13	22		2	-
Restrictions on Travel Due to Poor Roads	1	3	9	30		1	-
Excess Time Spent in Travelling to Schools	5	8	19	12		-	-
Too Many Schools, Teachers and Pupils in Proportion to ROE Staff (N = 43)	5	15	13	8		1	1
Lengthy and Indirect Avenues of Communication Between the School and the ROE	-	7	10	26		1	-
Suspicion Among Teachers and Principals of the Evaluative Role of the ROE	1	9	17	13		2	2

TABLE VII (Continued)

Problem	Seriousness					Not	Undecided	Don't Know
	Very	Fairly	Slightly					
	6	5	4	3	2	1		
Concern of Local School Jurisdictions Over Greater Control of Local Administration by the Department of Education	1	3	14	17	5	4		
Concern of School Boards About the Cost of Establishing the ROE	-	2	13	16	4	9		
Limited Awareness of and/or Misconceptions about the role of the ROE	2	17	13	11	-	1		
Duplication of ROE Services and A.T.A. Specialist Councils	-	1	2	37	3	1		
Implementating Innovations in <u>Old Buildings</u>	-	4	12	20	3	5		

TABLE VII (Continued)

Problem	Seriousness					Don't Know
	Very 6	Fairly 5	Slightly 4	Not 3	Undecided 2	
Implementing Innovations in <u>New Buildings</u>	-	1	5	31	2	5
Involvement in Other Official Functions for the Department of Education	2	5	12	25	-	-
Responsibility for Duties for Which the ROE has no Specialist Staff	2	11	14	16	-	1
Inadequate Training or Preparation for your Role in the ROE	1	3	13	26	1	-
Policy Imposed Without Consultation on ROE Personnel by Senior Officials	-	6	8	28	2	-

"Very serious" to "Fairly serious" by approximately half the consultants were the dispersion of small schools, the proportion of schools and teachers to ROE staff, and misconceptions about the role of the ROE. Three problems assessed as being serious ("Very serious -- "Slightly serious") by a majority of ROE staff were the time spent in travelling, suspicion of the evaluative role of the ROE, and the lack of a full range of specialist staff. Other specific problems noted were: (1) "lack of authority," (2) "who is to initiate action?", and (3) "unrealistic expectations for consultants."

Financial Restrictions

Consultants were asked to rate the seriousness of some financial restrictions on the operations of ROE. Results are provided in Table VIII. The majority of consultants regarded all the restrictions as serious problems with the exception of the issues of secretarial assistance and outside speakers. Inadequate funds to purchase demonstration materials and equipment were regarded as "Very serious" to "Fairly serious" by thirty-seven and thirty-two consultants respectively, while the associated problem of an operating budget was considered "Very serious" to "Fairly serious" by thirty consultants. Allowances for travel, accommodation and meals were "Very serious" to "Fairly serious" for twenty-seven consultants.

TABLE VIII
Opinions of ROE Staff Concerning Seriousness of Financial
Restrictions Encountered in the Operation of ROE
(N = 44)

Financial Restrictions	Seriousness				Undecided 2	Don't Know 1
	Very 6	Fairly 5	Slightly 4	Not 3		
Limited Secretarial Assistance	2	4	9	29	-	-
Restrictions on Mileage Allowance	12	15	9	7	-	1
Inadequate Funds to Purchase Equipment	16	16	5	7	-	-
Inadequate Funds to Purchase Demonstration Materials	20	17	5	1	-	1
Inadequate Allowances for Accommodation and Meals	14	13	9	7	-	1
Funds Do Not Allow for Engaging Outside Speakers at In-Service Functions	4	11	11	16	1	1
Each ROE Does Not Have an Operating Budget to Use at its Discretion	24	6	7	4	3	-

As the questions on financial restrictions provoked further comments, they are included below under the headings of each suggested area.

Secretarial assistance. It was suggested that "someone other than consultants should take care of filing, etc."

Mileage allowance. The comment was made that allowances were "unrealistic in terms of increases in costs" and "mileage rates have remained unchanged while responsibilities have been extended." For the mileage limit it was noted that although the 7000 mile limit was reached in six months, this would not curtail activities, but some consultants felt that they should not lose money to provide service. The suggestion was made that the limit be raised to 10,000 miles or that there be no limit, with a rate of at least 15¢ a mile.

Equipment. Funds were needed to purchase audio-visual equipment.

Demonstration materials. Some consultants have been using their own money or relying on the generosity of publishing representatives. The comment was made that "if we are to provide leadership we must be able to have the most up-to-date materials," and it is "difficult to recommend materials when you don't have

them."

Accommodation--meals. Two specific comments noted that "professionals . . . should not have to seek out the cheapest rates" and "provision should be made for . . . city-based conferences."

Outside speakers. Supporting the use of visiting speakers to address in-service seminars, one respondent observed that it would be "egotistical" to think that consultants could handle all aspects of a particular topic.

Operating budget. The provision of a budget for each ROE would permit "long term planning" and "enable priorities to be selected." It would also "permit greater selectivity in establishing a resources center, instead of relying on complimentary materials." Another comment noted that "to operate effectively, an ROE should be able to cut red tape on requisitions and purchases."

Other problems. Some additional problems noted by consultants were the need for a professional library and some technical personnel in the ROE. A policy was needed on attendance at conferences in the consultative area, and there was concern that no expenses were provided for conferences outside the region. Problems

were also created because "several members of Head Office have jurisdiction over ROE." Two other issues mentioned were the need to determine provisions for study leave and a new salary award.

Staffing Needs

In an attempt to determine the additional staff required in order to meet the needs of the zone, consultants were asked to list three areas in which they thought consultants should be next added to their ROE. Preferences for each ROE are listed in Table IX.

Administration Consultants

An open question to the five Administration Consultants in ROE asked them to indicate any special problems that they encountered in their work. While one consultant's only comment was that the work was "similar to the work of a school superintendent," four consultants provided details of problems. The lack of role definition was a major concern. A need to delineate the roles of administration consultant and field administration officer was mentioned, as well as the problem of acting as assistant coordinator without authority. Comprehensive responsibilities for which no extra pay was received were described in the following terms. The administration consultant is expected to. . . "work along with other consultants, act as an inspector

TABLE IX
Opinions of ROE Staff Concerning Priorities
for Additional Staff for Each ROE

Consultative Area	Preferences		
	1st	2nd	3rd
1. GRANDE PRAIRIE			
Science	6	1	
Early Childhood	1	1	1
Special Education	1	1	
Media		2	
Administration		1	1/2
Fine Arts			3 1/2
Research			1
Reading		1	
Speech and Hearing			1
2. ATHABASCA			
Curriculum	1	1	
Science	1 1/2		1/2
Human Relations		1	
Secondary Math	1/2		1/2
Fine Arts			1
Special Education		1	

TABLE IX (Continued)

Consultative Area	1st	Preferences 2nd	3rd
3. EDMONTON			
Social Studies	4	1	
Second Language	1	3	
Language Arts	1	1	1
Early Childhood		1	2
Industrial Education	1		
ROE Generalist	1		
Buildings		1	
Home Economics		1	
Administration			1
School Plant			1
Business Education			1
4. RED DEER			
Special Education	5	1	
Mathematics		3	
Early Childhood	1		2 1/2
Secondments	1		
Social Studies		1	
Interaction, Communication		1	
Administration			2
Business Education		1	
Second Language			1 1/2
Science			1
Intercultural Ed.			1/2

TABLE IX (Continued)

Consultative Area	1st	Preferences 2nd	3rd
5. CALGARY			
Language Arts	7	1	
Science		3	1
Curriculum	1		
Reading		1	
Fine Arts			2
Environmental Studies		1	
Special Education		1	
Elementary Ed.		1	
Early Childhood			1
Business Ed.			1
6. LETHBRIDGE			
Social Studies	4		1
Primary Education	1	2	
Field Administration		2	
Clinical Services		1	1 1/2
Intercultural Ed.	1		
Fine Arts		1	1/2
Physical Education			1
Innovation			1

(Note: 1/2 points indicate shared preference.)

for 200-300 teachers, serve Boards as a financial advisor, do extra little tasks for the Minister, be conversant with all aspects of P.P.B.E.S., look after kindergartens, and act as an unpaid, untitled second-in-command."

FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS IN REGIONAL OFFICES OF EDUCATION

Future Function

Most consultants (60 percent) predicted that the major functions of ROE will change in the next ten years. The major trends will be for the ROE to provide services for a "full range of education," and there will be a development of "materials centers and learning centers for the diagnosis of learning problems." Personnel deployment will include consultants working from ROE in Grande Prairie, Lethbridge and Red Deer, and inspectors and consultants working from Calgary and Edmonton. It was also considered that there will be an "increase in the administrative component as government becomes more complex." One consultant predicted that "regulatory as well as consultative functions as in Manitoba" will develop. However, predictions in this area tended to take the other direction. . . there will be "more consultation and less regulatory work," and in order to achieve set goals, a "change in emphasis in

consultation and the qualifications of consultants" will be required. Functions will be "more oriented to curriculum service, inservice and program evaluation," and "with increasing local autonomy (and its acceptance) the regulatory function will diminish." If decentralization is the aim of a Regional Office system then it was believed that more authority will be required for ROE. There will be further decentralization of regulations and services of the Department, and the ROE will become a "major resource center for rural areas" and provide coordination of government agencies. It was suggested that there will be "more generalists, with specialists in subject areas being taken from teacher ranks on a temporary basis as needs arise with curriculum revision." Subject area consultation will be broken down to cover major curriculum areas, and if the demand for services continues, there will be "a greater variety of specialists or elementary generalists."

Predictions in the staffing of ROE were that staff will require social science backgrounds and there will be specialists in "human relations," psychology, speech therapy, social work and reading. Staff requirements and specializations will increase which "hopefully will result in staff with expertise in their area," and more training in curriculum development and evaluation will be needed.

Coordination of Post-Secondary Education

Consultants were asked, "To what extent would you favor or oppose involvement of the ROE as an agency to coordinate post-secondary education within each Zone?" While some had not reached a firm decision on this issue, the majority expressed opinions which were opposed to the suggestion. The main arguments centered on three issues: (1) post-secondary education should be coordinated by a central agency in Edmonton, (2) staff are limited in ROE and there are greater needs from the K-12 area, and (3) ROE are still only developing.

Coordination With Other Government Departments

Consultants were mainly in favor of the proposal to coordinate the educational development of their region with the planning of other provincial government departments. It was noted that such a move would avoid duplication, there could even be coordination with some federal agencies, and eventually the involvement of other government departments in education may become superfluous. Two issues raised in opposition to the proposal were that the independence of the ROE would be in jeopardy, and there was a more pressing need to allow ROE to first establish their own position.

Secondment of Consultants

ROE staff were asked to express their opinion on the temporary secondment of consultants to and from universities, colleges and school systems. Their opinions were as follows.

	<u>Opinion</u>		
	In Favor	Against	Undecided
Secondments to ROE	67%	12%	21%
Secondments from ROE	46%	14%	40%

Secondments to ROE. Arguments that were used to support the temporary secondment of consultants to ROE were that it would "fill short-term needs," and "enable the ROE to mount major change efforts in concentrated doses." However, there would be a need to consider such problems as pension benefits, the lack of long-term commitment to ROE objectives and becoming familiar with ROE programs and clients. Opposition to the proposal mentioned that if seconded personnel came from the university they would be "out of touch with the classroom," that secondments should wait until the ROE are well established, and that "consultants possess expertise and therefore don't need other personnel."

Secondments from ROE. Opinion in favor of secondments from ROE was less pronounced, with 40 percent of respondents being "undecided." Some considered the move particularly appropriate in the area of teacher education "methods," it would "broaden the perspectives of consultants," and it may "influence faculties to change and meet changing conditions." The only problems associated with this were a possible salary loss, and the disruption of temporarily transferring to another home.

Regional Area

When asked if the geographical area encompassed by their Region was too large, 19 percent replied "yes," 62 percent replied "no," and 19 percent were "undecided." Only four consultants (9 percent) considered that there should be another ROE in their Region, twenty-eight (67 percent), said "no," and ten (24 percent) were "undecided."

Restructuring of the Department of Education

In view of the reaction that the ROE have been considered to be a duplication of services and an interference in local administration, the question was asked, "Do you see any need for some restructuring of the Department of Education to incorporate more of the specialist positions in the ROE?" In replies to this

question, 47 percent said "yes," 16 percent said "no," and 37 percent were "undecided." In further comments by consultants, one view was "to incorporate specialist staff in central office where they would be better located to work on a provincial basis." But the opposite point of view called for central office personnel in industrial arts, home economics, business education, special education and library to be located in the ROE. There was also a need to "provide the ROE with responsibility and authority to act in designated areas of concern," and to "incorporate all Field Services under the ROE so that there is no duplication." Field Administrative Officers attached to each ROE presently work in the central office of the Department of Education, but they should be placed in the ROE, and their function and role examined. There was an emphatic expression that the School Buildings Board represented a major problem, as well as the Operational Research Branch and its relationship to the rest of the Department. Field research and evaluation of innovative projects was considered to be a "legitimate function" of each ROE.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS

SUMMARY

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe the nature and role of Regional Offices of Education (ROE) in the province of Alberta. Particular emphasis was placed on determining the characteristics of ROE staff and their perceptions of ROE objectives, functions, success, difficulties, and future developments.

Associated Literature

In the literature there is evidence of confusion and contradiction about the objectives and functions of intermediate educational units. More emphasis was placed on the regulatory role in the early stages of their development, but in recent years there has been greater attention given to service aspects. Discussion of the need for intermediate units concentrates on the deficiencies of small school districts and the inability of large state education departments to meet the needs of schools and teachers. Assessments of the benefits derived from intermediate units have referred to their short period of operation and development.

Methodology

In November 1971, a questionnaire, specifically designed for the study, was submitted to all coordinators and consultants (N=44) in the six ROE operating in Alberta. Frequency and percentage frequency distributions were used to analyse most items.

Findings

Staff. Most of the ROE staff in Alberta were previously employed as superintendents, principals, vice-principals, department heads or teachers. About three quarters have a master's degree, and seventeen are currently enrolled in a master's or doctoral program.

Objectives. Almost all consultants considered that the provision of consultative services to teachers, school administrators and school boards was a major objective for ROE. Evaluation was considered to be a part of the consultative process but was not to be interpreted as "inspection" of schools or teachers. Other major objectives in order of the frequency with which they were mentioned by consultants were assisting in curriculum development and innovations, acting as a monitoring agent, and facilitating communication among the educational systems.

Functions. Consultants were divided as to whether schools should be visited periodically. They also challenged an assumption that the Department of Education has to control and monitor education in Alberta. Consultants indicated that planning procedures for buildings, program development, provisions for special education, and financial procedures should be assessed by ROE. Most consultants considered it necessary to visit a sample of schools in order to monitor the large urban systems. There was no unanimity among consultants about the need for continuing formal evaluation of schools and school systems. Only when evaluation was used in its "traditional meaning" did it interfere with the credibility of consultants. A large proportion of requests for services from ROE are required to be processed "through the hierarchy," as one coordinator described the teacher to principal to superintendent arrangement. Few contacts were made with the ROE by teachers independently or through the principal.

Success. In determining their priorities for allocation of services, consultants placed high priority on the attempt to equalize services between urban and rural areas. Consultants stated that rural areas have had limited support staff in the past, they have not been able to keep up with current educational ideas,

and that the provision of consultative services in such areas is a principal justification for ROE. Decentralization of some of the services of the central office has been one of the stated reasons for establishing ROE in Alberta. The highest rating by consultants of their success was in the area of providing consultation for individual teachers, then followed consultation related to system-wide programs, the interpretation of regulations, and evaluating individual schools.

Difficulties. Problems rated as "Very serious" to "Fairly serious" by half the consultants in influencing their effectiveness were the dispersion of small schools, the proportion of schools and teachers to ROE staff, and misconceptions about the role of the ROE. Major financial restrictions mentioned by consultants were the absence of an operating budget for each ROE, inadequate funds to purchase demonstration materials and equipment, inadequate allowances for accommodation and meals, and restrictions on mileage allowances.

Future. Sixty percent of consultants considered that there would be a change in the major functions of ROE in the next ten years. Most were opposed to the suggestion that ROE become involved as an agency to coordinate post-secondary education within each region. However, reactions were mainly in favor of the proposal

to coordinate the educational development of the region with the planning of other provincial government departments. Temporary secondment of consultants to ROE was generally supported. In view of the reaction that the ROE have been considered to be a duplication of services and an interference in local administration, almost half of the consultants considered that there was a need to restructure the Department of Education.

CONCLUSIONS

One of the main purposes of the study was to determine the objectives and functions of ROE as perceived by the staff associated with them in Alberta. Analysis of the data revealed that the provision of consultative services was the major objective for consultants. They believe that the service role of ROE should be developed and that less importance be attached to evaluation. Further support for this position is seen in the negative reaction to a controlling and monitoring function. When this is combined with the attitudes of consultants to evaluation and consultation, there is evidence that at least ROE staff are sensitive to the apparent dichotomy of consultative and regulatory functions. Perceptions of evaluation were related to the concept of consultation being applied in ROE, and while

variations were expected in these perceptions, overall there is an indication that they are contrary to formally established priorities. The wide range of expectations held for ROE is in part related to their short history, but with some evidence of confusion there is a need to clarify the role of ROE and to communicate this role definition throughout the educational system.

A second purpose of this study was to determine the perceived problems and assessments of success of the ROE. The channels of communication used between ROE and their clients indicate that a circuitous procedure is required in requesting consultative services, and that there is a minority of jurisdictions in which teachers may communicate directly with the ROE. Consultative services in rural areas were assessed as being minimal. Based only on the assessments of consultants, ROE have justified initial expectations of improving service, and decentralizing some of the services previously provided by the central office of the Department of Education.

Predictions of future developments in ROE was a third area of concern in this study. On such a limited base of experience any predictions should be treated with caution. Generally, there was agreement that there would be changes in functions for ROE to provide a full range of services, increased consultation, and involvement

in the coordination of regional educational development with other government departments.

IMPLICATIONS

There are implications for the administration of ROE in the importance attached by consultants to consultation, and in their questioning of the need for controlling and monitoring functions. Comparing the results of this study with literature on intermediate educational units, suggests that ROE in Alberta are developing along similar lines to comparable units in other Canadian provinces and the U.S.A. For this development to continue, and for the potential service role of ROE to be utilized in improving public education in Canada, there will need to be determined resistance to pressures which try to impose on ROE a role for which they were not designed.

Implications are revealed for the interrelationships between the component parts of the public education system. Results of this study support Isenberg's (1966:26-27) concern for the entire educational system. . . "when we tinker with one segment of it, all the other levels are affected." Divergent expectations for ROE are bound to create dysfunction. Consequently there needs to be close liaison between the Department of Education,

ROE, superintendents, school boards, principals and teachers. While the range of expertise provided by the large urban school systems may be superior to that of the ROE at this stage of their development, reciprocal involvement is required if regional planning and a joint approach to the educational problems of rural and urban areas are recognised.

There is support in this study for the idea that the ROE and intermediate units face an insecure future because of their vulnerability. If there is limited awareness of the service role of ROE and some suspicion of their evaluatory function, once this is clarified, consultants face the prospect of increased requests for assistance and judgement of their performance on already limited resources. At a time when increased staffing and expenditure in education are being critically examined, ROE in Alberta should be prepared to resolve this dilemma.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

As ROE have been established in Alberta only since September 1971, there are many studies that can be developed. Three specific suggestions are provided:

- (1) There is a need to describe the planning procedures used in the development of ROE in Alberta.

(2) An investigation should be made into the perceptions of teachers, principals, superintendents and school boards of the role and functions of ROE.

(3) An analysis is required of the compatibility of regulation, monitoring and evaluation as functions of ROE.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Campbell, Roald F. et al.
1970 The Organization and Control of American Schools. Second edition. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books.
- Cooper, Shirley and Charles O. Fitzwater
1954 County School Administration. New York: Harper and Row.
- Ellison, Elizabeth B.
1959 "A study to determine an adequate intermediate unit or units for a distinct geographical area in Nebraska." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska.
- Emerson, William J.
1967 "Intermediate School District, Middle Echelon of a Three-Echelon State System of Schools." Journal on State School Systems Development. I,1. (Spring)
- Hawkesworth, E. K.
1971 The Regional Office of Education Province of Alberta. Position paper. Department of Education, Alberta.
- Isenberg, Robert M.
1966 The Evolving Intermediate Unit. An address quoted from Proceedings of Conference on School District Reorganization and the Intermediate Service Unit. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.
- Knezevich, Stephen J.
1962 Administration of Public Education. New York: Harper and Bros.
- McClure, William P.
1956 The Intermediate Administrative School District in the U.S. Urbana: University of Illinois.
- McHenry, Vere A.
1965 "School District Reorganization in Utah." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah.

McPherran, Archie L.

- 1954 "The nature and role of the Intermediate District in American education." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska.

Miller, Van

- 1965 The Public Administration of American School Systems. New York: Macmillan.

Morphett, Edgar L. et al.

- 1967 Educational Organization and Administration. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Nault, Aime

- 1970 The State Education Department Regional Office: Its role, functions, and relationships within the educational system. Technical Report (unpublished). Quebec Department of Education.

Province of Alberta, Department of Education

- 1971 Memorandum. Re: Field Services Branch.

Rhodes, Alvin E. (ed.)

- 1963 Better Education through Effective Intermediate Units. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Stephens, E. Robert et al.

- The Multi-County Regional Educational Service Agency in Iowa.
- 1967a Part I. The Intermediate Unit of School Administration in the United States. Final Report.
- 1967b Part II. Appendix.
- 1967c Part III. Summary Report
Iowa City: Iowa Center for Research in School Administration, Iowa University.

Tindal, C.R.

- 1968 "Regional Administration: a study of Ontario Government Department Field Offices." Canadian Public Administration, XI, 2.

Turner, Glenn E.

- 1959 "The location and administration of intermediate school districts for the State of Nebraska." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

FUNCTIONS OF REGIONAL OFFICES OF EDUCATION IN ALBERTA

All Regional Office Coordinators and Consultants are requested to complete this questionnaire and return it by November 30, 1971.

STUDY DIRECTOR: Dr. E.A. Holdaway,
Department of Educational Administration,
University of Alberta,
Edmonton, Alberta.
Phone: 432-3690

A. PERSONAL DATA

(2)

1. For how many years (excluding the period September 1971 - November 1971) have you been employed in the following positions?

LOCATION	POSITION	NUMBER OF YEARS IN POSITION
Department of Education	High School Inspector	
	Superintendent	
	Other (specify):	
	1. _____	
	2. _____	
	3. _____	
Local Jurisdiction Central Office	Superintendent	
	Other Central Office position (specify):	
	1. _____	
	2. _____	
	3. _____	
	4. _____	
Local Jurisdiction School Based	Principal	
	Vice-Principal and/or Department head	
	Classroom teacher	
	Other (specify):	
	1. _____	
	2. _____	
Other (specify details)		
1. _____		
2. _____		
3. _____		
4. _____		

2. What was your previous position immediately before your present appointment? (Exclude University study)

(a) Title: _____

(b) Employing Authority: _____

(c) Number of years in position _____

3. List your current academic qualifications.

Degree or Diploma	Granting Institution	Year

4. Are you presently enrolled in a University graduate program?

Yes _____ No _____

If Yes, state (a) University _____

(b) Degree sought _____

(c) Program _____

5. What do you think should be the major objectives for Regional Offices of Education in Alberta?

State them briefly, and if you wish, place them in order of priority.

6. Which specific tasks (e.g. establishing programs in intercultural education, surveying the educational needs of the zone) have been set by your Regional Office?

(a) _____

(b) _____

(c) _____

7. Have any specific tasks been set for your Regional Office by the Department of Education?

(a) Yes _____ No _____ Undecided _____

(b) Please elaborate (naming the tasks if applicable):

8. Have you experienced a wide range of expectations for the functions of the Regional Office of Education?

(a) Yes _____ No _____

(b) Please elaborate: _____

9. Assuming that the Department of Education has to continue to control and monitor education in Alberta (i.e. ensuring that school procedures and programs meet required regulations), do you believe that all schools in your zone should be visited periodically (say, at least once every three years) by Regional Office staff?

(a) Yes _____ No _____ Undecided _____

(b) If yes, (i) by whom? _____
(ii) what aspects of school operation should be assessed?

(c) If no, do you feel that the control and monitoring functions should be performed by Department of Education staff not based in a Regional Office of Education?

(i) Yes _____ No _____ Undecided _____

(ii) Further comment: _____

10. Assuming that the Department of Education has to continue to control and monitor education in Alberta, what aspects of the operations of school boards and central offices of school districts, divisions and counties should be assessed?

- [illegible]

11. Assuming that the Regional Office of Education staff have to perform a monitoring function (i.e. ensuring that school programs meet required regulations) in the larger urban school systems, must the Regional Office of Education staff visit schools in these systems in order to perform this function?

(a) Yes ____ No ____ Undecided ____

(b) If Yes, can this function be performed adequately by using a sample (say 10%) of schools? Yes ____ No ____

(c) What aspects of the operations of these large urban systems should be assessed? _____

(d) Further comment: _____

12. Supplying evaluative services is one of the stated functions of the Regional Offices of Education. "Evaluation" is perceived to be (1) the assessment of a system, school, program or teacher in relation to objectives, followed by (2) constructive oral and/or written reports.

INSTRUCTIONS: (i) in column A rate the various areas of evaluation according to the importance you attach to evaluation in each area as a function of the Regional Office of Education staff. Place a number in the appropriate space.

(ii) in column B estimate the importance that you think superintendents attach to evaluation in each area as a function of Regional Office of Education staff.

(iii) in column C estimate the importance that you think principals and teachers attach to evaluation in each area as a function of Regional Office of Education staff.

Use this scale:

- 6. Very important
- 5. Fairly important
- 4. Slightly important
- 3. Not important
- 2. Undecided
- 1. Don't know

Areas of Evaluation	A	B	C
a. An entire school system			
b. Individual schools			
c. Individual teachers			
d. Programs (e.g. social studies) in all schools in a school system			
e. Programs in a particular grade (e.g. grade 9) or a group of grades (e.g. grades 8 and 9) in a school system			
f. Programs in a particular school			
g. Programs in a particular grade in a particular school			

Further comments: _____

13. Do you think that there is a need for continuing formal evaluation (e.g. of the type provided by the traditional urban high school cycle) of schools and school systems throughout Alberta by Department of Education central office staff who are located in Edmonton (i.e. not Regional Office staff) if the Regional Office staff are unable to perform this function?

(a) Yes____ No____ Undecided____

(b) Please elaborate: _____

14. Do you feel that the evaluatory function of your Regional Office interferes with your credibility as a consultant?

(a) Yes____ No____ Undecided____

(b) Please elaborate: _____

15. If a superintendent in your zone had completed his own evaluation, and required further formal evaluation of a certificated teacher, which may provide some of the evidence for dismissal, should this evaluation be performed by a person from:

(a) the Zone Regional Office? Yes____ No____ Undecided____

(b) a Regional Office in a different Zone? Yes____ No____ Undecided____

(c) the Department of Education Central Office in Edmonton? Yes____ No____ Undecided____

Please elaborate: _____

16. Is there any duplication in the services provided by the Professional Development programs of the Alberta Teachers' Association and the Regional Office consultants?

(a) Yes____ No____ Undecided____

(b) If there is duplication, does it provide:

(i) reinforcement? Yes____ No____ Undecided____

(ii) a source of conflict? Yes____ No____ Undecided____

(c) Please elaborate: _____

17. What value, if any, do you see in Regional Office consultants being involved with development and evaluation of instructional programs in the larger urban school systems?

18. Regional Offices of Education have been established to provide decentralization of some of the services previously provided by the Central Office of the Department of Education in Edmonton. To what extent do you think this decentralization has been successful in these areas?

Use this scale: 5. Very successful
 4. Fairly successful
 3. Slightly successful
 2. Not successful
 1. Undecided

- a. Providing consultative services related to system-wide programs
 b. Providing consultative services for individual teachers
 c. Interpreting Department of Education regulations
 d. Evaluating school systems
 e. Evaluating individual schools
 f. Involving teachers in curriculum development
 g. Providing assistance in planning school buildings
 h. Others (specify):

RESPONSE

Further comments: _____

19. One of the reasons for the establishment and development of Regional Offices of Education was that an attempt should be made to equalize educational services between the urban and rural areas of Alberta.

(a) How important is this reason in determining your priorities for allocation of services?

Very important	_____
Fairly important	_____
Slightly important	_____
Not important	_____
Undecided	_____

Please elaborate: _____

(b) Are there any particular difficulties which have restricted your work in providing services to rural areas?

Yes _____ No _____

Please elaborate: _____

(c) If there are any particular programs or approaches that have been introduced in your zone to improve services to rural areas, please list them below.

(d) Has the stated concern to equalize services between rural and urban areas interfered with or restricted your activities in helping to meet the needs of schools and school systems in urban areas?

Yes _____ No _____ Undecided _____

Please elaborate: _____

20. The following list states some of the problems which may be encountered in the operation of a Regional Office of Education. Rate the seriousness of each problem according to the effect of the problem on your effectiveness.

Use this scale: 6. Very serious
5. Fairly serious
4. Slightly serious
3. Not serious
2. Undecided
1. Don't know

- | | |
|--|--|
| a. Geographical dispersion of small schools | |
| b. Restrictions on travel due to adverse weather | |
| c. Restrictions on travel due to poor roads | |
| d. Excessive time spent in travelling to schools | |
| e. Too many schools, teachers and pupils in proportion to Regional Office staff | |
| f. Lengthy and indirect avenues of communication between the school and the Regional Office | |
| g. Suspicion among teachers and principals of the evaluative role of the Regional Office | |
| h. Concern of local school jurisdictions over greater control of local administration by the Department of Education | |
| i. Concern of School Boards about the cost of establishing the Regional Offices | |
| j. Limited awareness of and/or misconceptions about the role of the Regional Office | |
| k. Duplication of Regional Office services and A.T.A. Specialist Councils | |
| l. Implementing innovations in <u>old</u> buildings | |
| m. Implementing innovations in <u>new</u> buildings | |

- n. Involvement in other official functions for the Department of Education, e.g. curriculum committees, work as Official Trustee, attending conferences.
- o. Responsibility for duties for which the Regional Office has no specialist staff, e.g. kindergartens, private schools.
- p. Inadequate training or preparation for your role in the Regional Office
- q. Policy imposed without consultation on Regional Office personnel by senior officials of the Department
- r. Other problems (please specify):

21. Some possible restrictions relating to the financial allocation to each Regional Office are listed below. Rate the seriousness of each restriction as it affects your operation as a Regional Office staff member.

Use this scale:

- 6. Very serious
- 5. Fairly serious
- 4. Slightly serious
- 3. Not serious
- 2. Undecided
- 1. Don't know

- a. Limited secretarial assistance for the Coordinator and Consultants

Comment: _____

- b. Restrictions on mileage allowance

Comment: _____

- c. Inadequate funds to purchase equipment

Comment: _____

--

--

--

d. Inadequate funds to purchase demonstration materials

Comment: _____

e. Inadequate allowances for accommodation and meals

Comment: _____

f. Funds do not allow for engaging outside speakers at in-service functions.

Comment: _____

g. Each Regional Office of Education does not have an operating budget to use at its discretion.

Comment: _____

h. Other restrictions (please specify):

The following questions relate to your recommendations for future developments in the Regional Offices.

22. Do you think that the geographical area encompassed by your Zone is too large?

(a) Yes____ No____ Undecided____

(b) Please elaborate: _____

23. Should another Regional Office be developed in your Zone?

(a) Yes____ No____ Undecided____

(b) If Yes, (i) where? _____

(ii) why? _____

24. Should the present organization of Zones remain unchanged, what further Regional Office staff are now required to meet the needs of your Zone? To limit your response, list the three areas (i.e. functions) in which you think consultants should be next added.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

25. Do you see the major functions of the Regional Office of Education in ten years as being in any way different from its present major functions?

(a) Yes____ No____ Undecided____

(b) Please elaborate: _____

(c) If you do see a change in function, how will this affect staffing requirements for the Regional Offices?

26. To what extent would you favor or oppose the educational development of your Zone being coordinated with the planning of other provincial government departments? (e.g. Department of Health, Human Resources Development Authority, Department of Labor, Department of Youth)

27. Do you see a need for the secondment to Regional Offices of some consultants on a temporary basis from universities, colleges and/or school systems?

(a) Yes____ No____ Undecided____

(b) Please elaborate(e.g. advantages, problems, financing)

28. Do you see a need for the secondment from Regional Offices of Education of some consultants on a temporary basis to universities, colleges and/or school systems?

(a) Yes____ No____ Undecided____

(b) Please elaborate(e.g. problems, advantages, financing)

29. The establishment and development of the Regional Offices of Education have been received with varying reactions. Some have seen them as "branch offices" of the Department of Education, thus duplicating services already provided and interfering in local administration. Do you see any need for some restructuring of the Department of Education to incorporate more of the specialist positions in Regional Offices?

(a) Yes____ No____ Undecided____

(b) Please elaborate: _____

30. (a) Excluding the services provided by the Regional Offices and the Professional Development program of the A.T.A., what is your overall assessment of the extent of consultative services available to teachers in rural areas, i.e. assistance provided by central office personnel of school districts, divisions and counties, and/or principals, vice-principals and department heads?

(b) What recommendations, if any, would you make for improvements in the consultative services available in rural areas?

31. What benefits do you feel have already resulted from the work of your Regional Office?

32. To what extent would you favor or oppose involvement of the Regional Office of Education as an agency to coordinate post-secondary education within each Zone?

33. Administrative Consultants in Regional Offices of Education probably encounter a different set of problems than are faced by Consultants in subject areas.

Please comment on any of these special problems that you have encountered.

This image shows a full page of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page, typical of notebook paper. There is no handwriting or other markings on the page.

F. CHANNELS OF COMMUNICATION.

(22)

33. What official avenues have been established in directing the initial request to the Regional Office for consultative or evaluative services? Place one or more checks(✓) on each line to indicate the established official contact(s).

[illegible]

[illegible]

34. How do you, as Coordinator, supervise the work of Consultants in your Regional Office?

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

APPENDIX B



MEMORANDUM

FROM: B. L. Stringham
Director of Field Services

OUR FILE NO.:

YOUR FILE NO.:

TO: All Regional Office Personnel

DATE: November 12, 1971

Dr. E. A. Holdaway, Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Alberta, has been commissioned by the government to conduct a study into the administrative costs of education in Alberta. An examination of The Department of Education and the Regional Offices of Education was specifically included in the study by the Minister of Education; consequently, your co-operation in completing the questionnaire, *Functions of Regional Offices of Education in Alberta*, will be appreciated. The results of the study will, I believe, have significant impact upon the future activities of the Field Services Branch.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "B L Stringham".

Director of Field Services

APPENDIX C



November 19, 1971

I have been commissioned by the Minister of Education "to examine the Regional Offices of the Department of Education in light of their recent establishment." This is part of a larger study entitled "An Examination of Non-Instructional Positions, Functions and Costs in School Jurisdictions in Alberta." A letter from Mr. Bryant Stringham, Director of Field Services, is enclosed. Mr. Robin Chapman, a graduate student in this Department, is assisting in the analysis.

Questionnaires have been mailed directly to all Regional Office Coordinators and Consultants. Responses will be treated confidentially, and information will be combined to provide grouped data representing the opinions of Coordinators and Consultants throughout the Province. Please do not discuss your answers to the questionnaire with other Regional Office staff, because independent responses are requested.

Would you please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the stamped addressed envelope by November 30, 1971, if possible.

Yours sincerely,

E.A. Holdaway
Associate Professor

B30025